



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/943,670      | 08/31/2001  | Brad Pivar           | 7207-211            | 1117             |

27383 7590 05/08/2003

CLIFFORD CHANCE US LLP  
200 PARK AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NY 10166

EXAMINER

PUNIT, PRAKASH C

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2175

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/943,670

Applicant(s)

PIVAR ET AL.

Examiner

Prakash C Punit

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**


- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

  
DOV POPOVICI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strong (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,523) in view of Dyson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,269,399).

As to claim 1, Strong teaches a method of interactive processing of a document to be completed by more than one party over a computer network comprising the steps of:

selecting a document to be completed by more than one party (see column 3, lines 12-27; also see column 5, lines 64-67; also see column 1, lines 13-16; where “more than one party” is read on “users”);

providing at least one request to a first user (i.e. client 200) at a first location on a computer network for information used to complete the document (see column 6, lines 15-21; where “first location” is read on “web server 205”);

receiving at least one response to the least one request from the first user (200) used to complete the document (see column 6, lines 61-65);

providing at least one request to the computer network for information used to complete the document (see column 6, lines 15-21);

receiving at least one response to the least one request used to complete the document (see column 6, lines 61-65); and

writing information obtained from the first user used to complete the document onto at least one digital file (see column 4, lines 3-7; where “digital file” is read on “digital information”).

Strong does not expressly disclose a second user at a second location.

Dyson et al. discloses a second user at a second location (see column 7, lines 13-17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong to include a second user at a second location.

It would have obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong by the teachings of Dyson et al., because a second user at a second location, enables in exchanging information where both the parties (i.e. first and the second) need to provide input towards completion of a form or a document (see Dyson et al., column 6, lines 49-53).

As to claim 2, Strong as modified teaches a method, wherein the computer network is the Internet (see Fig. 2; also see column 5, line 64 through column 6, line 2).

As to claim 3, Strong as modified teaches a method, further comprising the step of:

Art Unit: 2175

determining whether the at least one response to the least one request from the first user (200) is valid (see column 7, lines 22-29) and sending at least one additional request to the first user (200) for additional information if the at least one response from the first user (200) is invalid (see column 7, lines 35-40).

As to claim 4, Strong as modified teaches a method, further comprising the step of: determining whether the at least one response to the least one request is valid (see column 7, lines 22-29) and sending at least one additional request to the second user for additional information if the at least one response is invalid (see column 7, lines 35-40).

Strong does not expressly disclose a second user.

Dyson et al. discloses a second user (see column 7, lines 13-17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong to include a second user.

It would have obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong by the teachings of Dyson et al., because by including a second user, it enables in exchanging information where both the parties (i.e. first and the second) need to provide input towards completion of a form or a document (see Dyson et al., column 6, lines 49-53).

As to claim 5, Strong as modified teaches a method, further comprising the step of: performing a routine (i.e. software program) determined from the selected document to provide feedback (600) to the first user (200) (see column 7, lines 60-67; also see column 8, lines 1-7),

Art Unit: 2175

the feedback (600) determined in part by the at least one response to the at least one request received from the first user (200) (see column 8, lines 11-27).

As to claims 6 and 7, Strong as modified teaches a method, further comprising the step of:

performing a routine (i.e. software program) determined from the selected document to provide feedback (600) (see column 7, lines 60-67; also see column 8, lines 1-7), the feedback (600) determined in part by the at least one response to the at least one request received (see column 8, lines 11-27).

Strong does not expressly disclose a second user.

Dyson et al. discloses a second user (see column 7, lines 13-17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong to include a second user.

It would have obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong by the teachings of Dyson et al., because by including a second user, it enables in exchanging information where both the parties (i.e. first and the second) need to provide input towards completion of a form or a document (see Dyson et al., column 6, lines 49-53).

As to claim 10, Strong teaches a system of interactive processing of a document comprising:

a storage device (see Fig. 1, elements 130 and 150);

a processor connected to the storage device and to a first user on a computer network (see Fig. 1, element 110);

the storage device storing a program for controlling the processor (see Fig. 1; also see column 4, lines 13-15; where “program” is read on “sequences of instructions”); and the processor operative with the program to:

send at least one request associated with a selected document to a first user (200)

at a first location on a computer network (see column 6, lines 15-21);

receive at least one response to the at least one request from the first user (200) (see column 6, lines 61-65);

send at least one request associated with the selected document on a computer network (see column 6, lines 15-21);

receive at least one response to the at least one request (see column 6, lines 61-65); and

write information obtained from the at least one response from the first user onto the at least one digital file (see column 4, lines 3-7; where “digital file” is read on “digital information”).

Strong does not expressly disclose a second user at a second location.

Dyson et al. discloses a second user at a second location (see column 7, lines 13-17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong to include a second user at a second location.

It would have obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong by the teachings of Dyson et al., because a second user at a second location, enables in exchanging information where both the parties (i.e. first and the second) need to provide input towards completion of a form or a document (see Dyson et al., column 6, lines 49-53).

3. Claims 8, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strong (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,523) in view of Dyson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,269,399), further in view of Zabetian (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,656).

As to claim 8, Strong discloses a method of interactive processing of a document to be completed by more than one party over a computer network comprising the steps of:

selecting a document to be completed by more than one party (see column 3, lines 12-27; also see column 5, lines 64-67; where “more than one party” is read on “remote client”);

providing at least one request to a first user (200) at a first location on a computer network for information used to complete the document (see column 6, lines 15-21);

receiving at least one response to the least one request from the first user (200) used to complete the document (see column 6, lines 61-65);

providing at least one request on the computer network for information used to complete the document (see column 6, lines 15-21);

receiving at least one response to the least one request used to complete the document (see column 6, lines 61-65); and



writing information obtained from the at least one response from the first user (200) onto at least one digital file (see column 4, lines 3-7; where “digital file” is read on “digital information”); wherein upon the recognition of an occurrence of an event on the computer network (see Fig. 2).

Strong does not teach a second user at a second location.

Dyson et al. teaches a second user at a second location (see column 7, lines 13-17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong to include a second user at a second location.

It would have obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong by the teachings of Dyson et al., because a second user at a second location, enables in exchanging information where both the parties, first and the second need provide input towards completion of a form or a document (see Dyson et al., column 6, lines 49-53).

Strong as modified still does not teach a digital signature routine is performed on the at least one digital file to obtain a digital signature of the at least one digital file and wherein a time stamp corresponding to the time of the recognition of the occurrence of the event is created and sent to a remote location.

Zabetian teaches a digital signature routine is performed on the at least one digital file to obtain a digital signature of the at least one digital file (see Fig. 3, element 310) and wherein a time stamp corresponding to the time of the recognition of the occurrence of the event is created

Art Unit: 2175

(see column 4, line 65 through column 5, line 4) and sent to a remote location (see Fig. 1; also see column 3, line 56 through column 4, line 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong as modified to include performing digital signature of a digital file with a time stamp feature.

It would have obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong as modified by the teachings of Zabetian, because being able to perform digital signature of a document with time stamp, provides better and convenient means of authenticating important and time sensitive documents (see Zabetian, column1, lines 25-59).

As to claim 9, Strong discloses a method of interactive processing of a document to be completed by more than one party over a computer network comprising the steps of:

selecting a document to be completed by more than one party (see column 3, lines 12-27; also see column 5, lines 64-67; where “more than one party” is read on “remote client”);

providing at least one request to a first user (200) at a first location on a computer network (see Fig. 2) for information used to complete the standardized form (see column 6, lines 15-21);

receiving at least one response to the least one request from the first user (200) used to complete the document (see column 6, lines 61-65);

writing information obtained from the at least one response from the first user (200) onto at least one digital file (see column 4, lines 3-7; where “digital file” is read on “digital information”);

providing at least one request on the computer network for information used to complete the document (see column 6, lines 15-21);

receiving at least one response to the least one request from used to complete the document (see column 6, lines 61-65); and

writing information obtained from the at least one response onto the at least one digital file (see column 4, lines 3-7; where “digital file” is read on “digital information”);

Strong does not teach the second user.

Dyson et al. teaches the second user (see column 7, lines 13-17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong to include a second user.

It would have obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong by the teachings of Dyson et al., because by including a second user, it enables in exchanging information where both the parties (i.e. first and the second) need to provide input towards completion of a form or a document (see Dyson et al., column 6, lines 49-53).

Strong does not expressly disclose performing a first and second digital signature routine on the at least one digital file to obtain a first and second digital signatures of the at least one digital file; creating a first and second time stamps corresponding to the time of submission of

the information obtained from the at least one response from the first user; sending the first and second digital signatures and the first and second time stamps to a remote location.

Zabetian discloses performing a first and second digital signature routine on the at least one digital file to obtain a first and second digital signatures of the at least one digital file (see Fig. 3, element 310; see column 12, lines 40-48; it is indicated that a second digital signature is performed if the subject matter within document is changed since the digital signature was created);

creating a first and second time stamps (see column 4, line 65 through column 5, line 4; also see column 13, line 38 through column 14, line 15; it is clearly indicated that a second time stamp is created for a document if the subject matter within document is changed since the first time stamp was created) corresponding to the time of submission of the information obtained from the at least one response from the first user (200);

sending the first and second digital signatures and the first and second time stamps to a remote location (see Fig. 1; also see column 3, line 56 through column 4, line 1; it is indicated that all digital signatures are stored in the database which is remotely located from the client system);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong to include performing first and second digital signature of a digital file with a time stamp feature.

It would have obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong by the teachings of Zabetian, because being able to perform

digital signature of a document with time stamp, provides better and convenient means of authenticating important and time sensitive documents (see Zabetian, column1, lines 25-59).

As to claim 11, Strong teaches a system of interactive processing of a document comprising:

- a storage device (see Fig. 1, elements 130 and 150);

- a processor connected to the storage device and to a first user on a computer network (see Fig. 1, element 110);

- the storage device storing a program for controlling the processor (see Fig. 1; also see column 4, lines 13-15; where “program” is read on “ sequences of instructions”); and

- the processor operative with the program to:

  - send at least one request determined from a selected document to a first user (200)

  - at a first location on a computer network (see column 6, lines 15-21);

  - receive at least one response to the at least one request from the first user (200)

  - (see column 6, lines 61-65);

  - write information obtained from the at least one response from the first user (200)

  - onto at least one digital file (see column 4, lines 3-7; where “digital file” is read on “digital information”);

  - corresponding to the receipt of the at least one response to the at least one request from the first user (200) (see column 6, lines 61-65);

- send at least one request determined from the selected document to on a computer network (see column 6, lines 15-21);

receive at least one response to the at least one request from the user (see column 6, lines 61-65); and

write information obtained from the at least one response onto at least one digital file (see column 4, lines 3-7; where “digital file” is read on “digital information”);

corresponding to the receipt of the at least one response to the at least one request from the user (see column 6, lines 61-65); associated the at least one digital file (see column 4, lines 3-7; where “digital file” is read on “digital information”) in the database (130).

Strong does not expressly disclose a second user at a second location.

Dyson et al. discloses a second user at a second location (see column 7, lines 13-17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong to include a second user at a second location.

It would have obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong by the teachings of Dyson et al., because a second user at a second location, enables in exchanging information where both the parties, first and the second need provide input towards completion of a form or a document (see Dyson et al., column 6, lines 49-53).

Strong does not expressly disclose a timing device connected to the processor; determine a first and second time stamp from the timing device; perform a first and second digital signature routine on the at least one digital file to obtain an original digital signature; record the first and

second time stamp and first and second original digital signature associated the at least one digital file in a database.

Zabetian discloses a timing device connected to the processor (see Fig. 2A, element 222; also see column 4, line 65 through column 5, line 2); determine a first and second time stamp from the timing device (see column 4, line 65 through column 5, line 4; also see column 13, line 38 through column 14, line 15; it is clearly indicated that a second time stamp is created for a document if the subject matter within document is changed since the first time stamp was created); perform a first and second digital signature routine on the at least one digital file to obtain an original digital signature (see Fig. 1; also see column 3, line 56 through column 4, line 1; it is indicated that a second digital signature routine is performed on a document incase the subject matter within the document has been altered since the first digital signature); record the first and second time stamp and first and second original digital signature associated the at least one digital file in a database (see column 13, line 6-15; also see column 13, lines 38-65; it is indicated that the digital signature and time stamp information is stored with a serial number in the database).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong to include performing first and second digital signature of a digital file with a time stamp feature.

It would have obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Strong by the teachings of Zabetian, because being able to perform digital signature of a document with time stamp, provides better and convenient means of authenticating important and time sensitive documents (see Zabetian, column1, lines 25-59).

*Conclusion*

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to method of document processing in general:

U.S. Patent No. 6,269,399 to Dyson et al. – teaches communication and validation of data

U.S. Patent No. 6,167,523 to Strong – teaches forms data validation and time stamp

U.S. Patent No. 6,327,656 to Zabetian. – teaches digital signature and time stamp

U.S. Patent No. 6,502,135 to Munger et al. – teaches validation of data

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prakash Punit whose telephone number is (703) 305-5914. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays – Fridays from 9:45 am to 6:15 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached on (703) 305-3830. The fax numbers of the group is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.




Application/Control Number: 09/943,670

Page 16

Art Unit: 2175

Prakash Punit  
Patent Examiner  
Au 2175

May 5, 2003



DOV POPOVICI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100